

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CASBN 44332)  
United States Attorney

BRIAN J. STRETCH (CASBN 163973)  
Chief, Criminal Division

JEFFREY SCHENK (CASBN 234355)  
RICHARD CHENG (CASBN 135992)  
Assistant United States Attorneys

U.S. Attorney's Office  
150 S. Almaden, 9th Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Telephone: (408) 535-2695/5032  
Facsimile: (408) 535-5066  
jeffrey.b.schenk@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	No.: CR 08-00156 JW
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	UNITED STATES' ADDITIONAL
	)	PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS
v.	)	
	)	Hearing: August 5, 2008
STEVEN RODRIGUEZ,	)	Time: 9:00 AM
	)	Court: Hon. J. Ware
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

The United States of America, through its counsel Jeffrey Schenk and Richard Cheng, Assistant United States Attorneys, hereby submits addition proposed jury instructions in the above-captioned case.

In addition to the list of proposed jury instructions filed by the government on July 23, 2008 and reprinted here, the United States requests that the Court give the following additional instructions:

The government requests that the Court give the following non-exhaustive list of standard instructions from the Ninth Circuit Manual of Model Criminal Jury Instructions, 2003 Edition:

Preliminary Instructions:

1.1 – Duty of Jury

1.3 – What is Evidence

1.4 – What is Not Evidence

1.5 – Evidence For Limited Purpose

1.6 – Direct and Circumstantial Evidence

1.7 – Ruling on Objections

1.8 – Credibility of Witnesses

1.8 – Conduct of the Jury

1.10 – No Transcript Available to Jury

1.11 – Taking Notes

1.12 – Outline of Trial

Instructions in the Course of Trial:

2.1 – Cautionary Instruction - First Recess

2.2 – Bench Conferences and Recesses

2.4 – Stipulations of Fact

Instructions at End of Case:

3.1 – Duties of Jury to Find Facts and Follow Law

3.2 – Charge Against Defendant Not Evidence - Presumption of Innocence - Burden of Proof

3.3 – Defendant’s Decision Not to Testify [or 3.4 – Defendant’s Decision to Testify]

3.5 – Reasonable Doubt – Defined

3.6 – What is Evidence

3.7 – What is Not Evidence

3.8 – Direct and Circumstantial Evidence

3.9 – Credibility of Witnesses

3.10 – Evidence of Other Acts of Defendant or Acts and Statements of Others

3.18 – Possession–Defined

Consideration of Particular Evidence:

4.1 – Statements by Defendant

4.14 – Eyewitness Identification

4.17 – Opinion Evidence, Expert Witness

Responsibility:

5.6 – Knowingly – Defined

Count One - Firearms - Unlawful Possession § 922(g)(1)

8.59 - Firearms-Ammunition-Unlawful Possession

The defendant is charged in Count One of the superseding indictment with the possession of a firearm and ammunition in violation of Section 922(g)(1) of Title 18 of the United States Code. In order for the defendant to be found guilty of that charge, the government must prove each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, the defendant knowingly possessed the charged firearm and ammunition;

Second, the firearm and ammunition had been shipped or transported from one state to another or from a foreign nation to the United States; and

Third, at the time the defendant possessed the firearm and ammunition, the defendant had been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year. The defendant stipulates that on February 23, 2007, the defendant was convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year.

Count Two - Firearms - Unlawful Possession § 922(g)(3)

The defendant is charged in Count Two of the superseding indictment with being an unlawful controlled substance abuser in possession of a firearm and ammunition in violation of Section 922(g)(3) of Title 18 of the United States Code. In order for the defendant to be found guilty of that charge, the government must prove each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, the defendant knowingly possessed the charged firearm and ammunition;

Second, the firearm and ammunition had been shipped or transported from one state to another or from a foreign nation to the United States; and

1 Third, the defendant's use of a controlled substance was ongoing and contemporaneous with  
2 the defendant's possession of the firearm and ammunition. Although, the government does not  
3 need to show the defendant was under the influence of an illegal drug at the exact same time he  
4 possessed the firearm and ammunition.<sup>1</sup>

5  
6  
7 DATED: July 29, 2008

8 Respectfully submitted,

9 JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO  
10 United States Attorney

11  
12 /s/  
13 JEFFREY B. SCHENK  
14 Assistant United States Attorney  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

---

23  
24 <sup>1</sup> In United States v. Bernadine, the 11<sup>th</sup> Circuit held that, to be an "unlawful user  
25 of" marijuana, a defendant's use must be "ongoing and contemporaneous with the commission of  
26 the offense. Bernadine, 73 F.3d 1078, 1082 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003). *See* United States v. Bennett 329  
27 F.3d 769, 778 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003). The Bennett court found that there is no need for a defendant's  
28 use to be "simultaneous[]" with firearm possession. *See also* United States v. Solomon 95 F.3d  
33, 35 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996). The Solomon court held that "The government does not need to show  
the defendant was under the influence of an illegal drug at the exact same time he possessed a  
firearm."